

John Rosselli: His Murder and Its Implications

— Part 2

Jim Kostman
David Williams
Assassination Information Bureau
63 Inman Street
Cambridge, MA 02139

(Continued from "People and the PURSUIT of Truth" for September 1976, page 5.)

"No Comment" — Morgan

Morgan is referred to in the Senate report only as the "Washington lawyer." When we reached Morgan at his office in the prestigious Washington firm of Welsh, Morgan and Kleindienst, he refused to either confirm or deny that he was the lawyer in question. He did admit to us, however, that he had testified to the Select Committee. The report cites testimony by the "Washington lawyer" on March 17, 1976, (p. 83) but Morgan couldn't remember the date of his appearance. Interestingly, the "Washington lawyer" told the committee that he had "no recollection of being interviewed by any FBI agent about the information he gave to Drew Pearson." (p. 85) The AIB first publicly identified Morgan as the lawyer referred to in the committee's report at a news conference on June 25, 1976. Two months later, the "Washington Post" printed the story, but the "Post" had no success in getting Morgan to comment on the report. ("Washington Post," 8/22/76)

Morgan's Clients

Both of Morgan's clients were questioned by the Select Committee about what they told Morgan. Apparently, they stonewalled it, since the report notes that they had "no recollection of either receiving information that Castro retaliated or discussing it with the lawyer." (p. 85) Perhaps if they had known they would be named in the report they would have been more cooperative.

One of the clients was John Rosselli. It was probably Rosselli who found the Warren Report's view of Lee Oswald so hilarious.

But it was not until after Rosselli's death, that the "Washington Post" identified him as one of Morgan's two clients. ("Post" 8/22/76) If the news media had reported the story earlier, or if, last June, the Senate report had named Rosselli, he might be alive today.

Morgan, incidentally, continues to decline comment on the report that Rosselli was one of his two clients, or on any other aspect of the story.

Questions to Ponder

Among the many unanswered questions raised by the Morgan -- Rosselli affair, one stands out. Why did Rosselli decide to tell Morgan when he did, what he claimed to know about the Kennedy assassination? It has been suggested that his action was purely self-serving, that Rosselli was struggling to avoid deportation to Italy for living in the U.S. under a false name. But this would explain only why Rosselli might reveal his CIA connections. It remains a mys-

tery why he raised the spectre of the Kennedy assassination.

Another unanswered question about this affair is: What was President Lyndon Johnson's real position? The Select Committee Report is completely unhelpful in this regard. The report criticizes the FBI for not conducting a proper investigation of the Morgan story, but the peculiar role of the White House is ignored.

There is a chronology of events in an appendix to the report where we learn that three weeks after the FBI interviewed Morgan, Johnson had become "convinced" that there was a conspiracy in the JFK assassination. A recent report in the Detroit "News" (6/27/76) suggests that LBJ was then trying to get the FBI to investigate possible CIA involvement in the assassination. This conflicts, however, with numerous private statements during Johnson's last years, some of which have since been widely reported, indicating his own belief in the "Castro did it" theory.

What strategy was Johnson using in early 1967? The evidence is increasing that immediately after the assassination in 1963 many government officials, persuaded by what should now be viewed as suspicious reports emanating from CIA agents, mobsters, and right-wing Cuban exiles, feared that Castro was involved in the assassination. To prevent a hysterical public reaction to these reports and a possible U.S. military intervention in Cuba which might have started a war, Johnson created the Warren Commission and imposed the lone assassin theory on the public.

Years later, after leaving office, Johnson revealed his doubts about the "lone assassin" theory. Did he still harbor secret misgivings about the "Castro/ did it" theory, or did he accept that theory sincerely?

The CIA Inspector General's Report for Johnson

There is one more chapter to the story at present. After he failed to compel the FBI headed by J. Edgar Hoover to investigate Morgan's story, LBJ turned to the CIA. The Agency's Inspector General was ordered to produce a report on the Castro assassination plots. CIA director Richard Helms briefed Johnson orally on the report in April or May, 1976. (Select Committee Report, p. 86)

It is not known exactly what position was taken by the still secret Inspector General's Report upon the "Castro did it" theory. But, nearly nine years after it was written, the report became the chief documentary source for the Senate investigation of

THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY:

THE APPLICATION OF COMPUTERS TO THE PHOTOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE - EXCERPT

Richard E. Sprague
Hartsdale, NY

First published,
May 1970

Being the first two pages of the longest and the most important article published in 25 years of publication of "Computers and Automation"

On November 22, 1963, in Dallas, Texas, President John F. Kennedy, while riding in an open limousine through Dealey Plaza and waving to the surrounding crowds, was shot to death. Lee Harvey Oswald, an ex-Marine, and former visitor to the Soviet Union, was arrested that afternoon in a movie theatre in another section of Dallas; that night he was charged with shooting President Kennedy from the sixth floor easternmost window of the Texas School Book Depository Building overlooking Dealey Plaza. This act Oswald denied steadily through two days of questioning (no record of questions and answers was ever preserved). Two days later while Oswald was being transferred from one jail to another, he was shot by Jack Ruby, a Dallas night-club owner, in the basement of the Dallas police station, while millions of Americans watched on television. The commission of investigation, appointed by President Lyndon B. Johnson, and headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U. S. Supreme Court, published its report in September 1964, and concluded that Oswald was the sole assassin and that there was no conspiracy.

In view of the authority of the Warren Commission, that conclusion was accepted by many Americans for a long time. But the conclusion cannot be considered true by any person who carefully considers the crucial evidence — such as the physics of the shooting, the timing of a number of events, and other important and undeniable facts. In other words, Oswald was not the sole assassin, and there was a conspiracy.

This article will develop that thesis, prove it to be true on the basis of substantial, conclusive evidence, and in particular some analysis of the photographic evidence.

There was in fact a conspiracy. Oswald played a role in the conspiracy, although there is conclusive evidence that on November 22, 1963, he did no shooting at President Kennedy, and that, just as he claimed when he was in the Dallas jail, he was a "patsy." At least three gunmen (and probably four) — none of whom were in the sixth floor easternmost window of the Texas School Book Depository building where the Warren Commission placed Oswald — fired a total of six shots at President Kennedy.

One of these shots missed entirely; one hit Governor John B. Connally, Jr. of Texas, riding with Kennedy; and four hit President Kennedy, one in his throat, one in his back, and two in his head. (The bulk of the undeniable evidence for these statements about the shots consists of: (a) the physics of the motions of Kennedy and Connally shown in some 60 frames of the famous film by Abraham Zapruder; (b) the locations of the injuries in Kennedy and in Connally; and (c) more than 100 pictures, consisting of more than 30 still photographs and more than 70 frames of movies.)

More than 50 persons were involved in the conspiracy at the time of firing the shots. These persons included members of the Dallas police force (but not all of the Dallas police — and that ac-

counts for some strange events), elements of the Central Intelligence Agency, some anti-Castro Cuban exiles, some adventurers from New Orleans, and some other groups. After the assassination, some very highly placed persons in the United States government became accessories to the crime. In other words, they participated in assiduous concealment of important facts, in shielding the perpetrators of the crime, and in spreading a thick layer of rewritten history (in the manner of George Orwell's famous novel "1984") over the whole crime.

Of course, asserting these statements makes them neither true nor believable. Without very strong evidence, it would be evil to make such statements. As to believability, prior to District Attorney Jim Garrison's trial of Clay Shaw in New Orleans in Feb. and March, 1969, public opinion polls in the United States showed that over 75 percent of the people in the United States believed that there was a conspiracy. The press, radio, and TV almost everywhere in the United States reported Garrison's investigation and the New Orleans trial in a very distorted way. Furthermore, Garrison did not prove to the satisfaction of the New Orleans jury that Clay Shaw was involved in the conspiracy, even though he proved that Shaw knew and met Oswald. The news media of the United States (except for two newspapers in New Orleans) reported the trial in such a way as to show that no conspiracy existed. The media largely succeeded in changing U.S. public opinion, if we judge from the falling off of the poll percentages.

But the United States' media have been proved wrong many times before, and they will be proved wrong again in this case. For example, the press of the United States almost entirely refused to believe for five years (1903 to 1908) that the Wright brothers had flown in a flying machine heavier than air. Only after the Wright brothers had won spectacular air races and demonstrated other successful flights in France, did the majority of the "hard-headed" American press believe that the Wright brothers had flown!

But the evidence cited or referred to in this article, and the existing photographic evidence and its analysis, a little of which is published here, establishes the fact of conspiracy. This evidence along with other evidence should and can initialize a major change in the beliefs of the people of the United States. As for beliefs of the people of Europe, it has long been and still is accepted there that President John F. Kennedy was assassinated by a conspiracy.

What is the Evidence?

The evidence for the statement — "the Warren Commission conclusions are false" — is now overwhelming.

There now exists not only a mountain of new evidence, but also considerable new analysis of the old evidence, the evidence which the Commission itself published in the 26 volumes of Evidence and Hearings accompanying the Warren Report. Much of the new evidence and the new analyses of the old evidence are available for any serious researcher's inspection; if any such person is interested, he should write me.

There are four prime sources of new evidence and analysis:

1. Researchers all over the United States, some affiliated with the National Committee to Investigate Assassinations (NCTIA), others acting independently but cooperating with the NCTIA, have obtained new evidence from witnesses, and even from conspirators — including admissions and confessions.

2. The new evidence includes new photographic evidence, some of which is reproduced or described in this article.
3. Researchers have produced scientific, solidly-based analyses of the old and new evidence and published these analyses in books and articles.
4. The office of District Attorney Jim Garrison in New Orleans has, under his direction, carried on (and continues to carry on) an extensive investigation of President Kennedy's assassination. Much of this evidence has been made available to the NCTIA.

This article concentrates on some of the photographic evidence and problems of computerized analysis. However, for the benefit of readers who would like to examine some of the other evidence, a few very important and interesting references will be mentioned next.

Four Important Reference Books

One valuable book is Six Seconds in Dallas, by Professor Josiah Thompson, a professor of philosophy at Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., published in 1968 by Bernard Geis and Associates, New York, 323 pages. Thompson made a thorough and competent analysis of the happenings during the six seconds when President Kennedy and Governor Connally of Texas were shot. With the cooperation of Life magazine during the first part of his investigation, he looked at the clear original of the Zapruder film. (After that, Life magazine locked the film up and denied any further access, until Garrison subpoenaed the film for the New Orleans trial of Clay Shaw.) Thompson showed that at least three gunmen shot at the President, and that one of the fatal shots came from the front and not the back.

Another impeccably scholarly book is Accessories after the Fact, by Sylvia Meagher, published in 1967 by Bobbs Merrill Co., Indianapolis, Ind., 477 pages. She presents a most thorough analysis of the gaps, conflicts, contradictions, and failures to investigate, that are clearly revealed by careful study of the Warren Commission Report and the 26 volumes of supporting documents.

A third important book is Inquest: the Warren Commission and the Establishment of Truth, by Edward Jay Epstein, published by the Viking Press, New York, N.Y., 1966, 224 pp. Epstein makes a pregnant remark at the beginning of his Chapter 9, "The major problem in the writing of the Report was the selection of the evidence. From the tens of thousands of pages of evidence, which facts were to be included and which facts excluded?" This book is an illuminating account of what actually did happen in the work of the staff of the Warren Commission, and why and how they could have reached the wrong conclusions.

A fourth significant book is Farewell America, by James Hepburn, published in Canada and in Belgium by Frontiers Publishing Co., Vaduz, Liechtenstein, 1968, 418 pp. (One cannot be sued in Liechtenstein.) This book is apparently based largely on information collected by certain former members of the French intelligence service, who penetrated the plot to assassinate President Kennedy. According to the book jacket, the author, James Hepburn, attended the London School of Economics and later graduated from the Institute of Political Studies in Paris. (However, "Hepburn" is a pseudonym.) The book gives a large amount of information about the plot to assassinate Kennedy, its background, and parallels in history. The book alleges that J. Edgar Hoover knew of the plot beforehand and did nothing to stop it. It also alleges that a Texas oil millionaire, some other oil men, some Texas and

Californian rightists, leaders of the Dallas city government, many members of the Dallas Police Department, and many members of the CIA, the FBI, and the Secret Service, all were involved in the plot. I do not agree with nor believe some of these allegations.

Appendix 1 of this book lists many "classified" documents in the National Archives of the United States, such as no. 931, a secret CIA document entitled "Oswald's access to information about the U-2" (the spy plane). Appendix 2 lists more references, entitled "reports, memoranda, and documents" such as "Dossier Richard M. Helms", "General Dynamics Dossier F 111" — but how to get access to these references is nowhere mentioned. Pages 308 to 324 contain a remarkable account of twenty years' activity by the CIA. Much of the information in the book is clearly true; other information is probable or plausible; some information is clearly in the category "possible but hard to believe" and by no means proved.

For reasons that may be guessed, this book is very hard to obtain in the United States but it can be bought in other countries. Although it has Library of Congress catalog no. 68-57391, at the Library of Congress it is "not available". Commercial importation of the book has been blocked by the U.S. Customs and the U.S. Post Office. A movie with the same title has been made by the publishers of the book; the movie, "Farewell America", has been shown in several European cities, but no copies of the film are so far available in the United States.

A number of important reference books are included in the partial bibliography at the end of this article. Among the more important authors are Harold Weisberg, Paris Flammande, Mark Lane, Rosemary James, Joachim Joesten, and Raymond Marcus. A fuller bibliography is available from the NCTIA.

The New Orleans Trial of Clay Shaw

One of the largest additional installments of new public evidence came out of three weeks of court testimony given in New Orleans, Feb. and March, 1969, when District Attorney Jim Garrison charged Clay Shaw with having a part in the conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy.

The trial was accurately and very fully reported in The Times Picayune, Feb. 7, 1969 to March 2, 1969, the leading daily paper in New Orleans, published since 1847. The record of the trial as published in The Times Picayune contains many indications that:

1. Clay Shaw did know and meet with Lee Harvey Oswald (dead), David Ferrie (dead), and Jack Ruby (dead), and exchange money with them. Twelve witnesses saw them together in twos and threes, at various times and places.
2. There were at least three gunmen in Dealey Plaza firing at President Kennedy on November 22, 1963, from at least two directions, and therefore there was a conspiracy.

What Garrison failed to prove to the satisfaction of the New Orleans jury was that Clay Shaw was involved in the conspiracy in Dallas. ☐

The article contained 11 photographs, a chart of Dealey Plaza, a time chart of the frames of the Zapruder film, and a list of 510 photographs and movie sequences. The Warren Commission examined 26 photographs or about 5% of the 510.

This article is still in print and available from the publisher of "Pursuit." (price: \$3.00 prepaid)

Using individual frames of the Z-film (from Life Magazine, Paris Match, and the Warren Exhibits) he was able to estimate the position of the men in the car. (It should be noted that there were over 20 photographers in the Plaza that day located on both sides of the motorcade.)

A travel line was drawn tangent to the curved route. The intersection of the travel line with the flightpath provided the basis for measuring the angles. (Afterward the flightpath was transferred to the detail of the limousine and the position of the men.)

The Commission determined that JFK was struck between Z-210 and Z-225. Cutler tested five Z-frames Z-186, Z-198, Z-210, Z-225, and Z-234. The angle from the earliest frame to the last was 17° to 7° from right to left. The average measure of the angle was 11°, and in each of the tests the flightpath failed to provide for a wound on Connally's right side, near his right arm pit. As a matter of fact all the flightpaths passed on Connally's left side or missed him altogether. /17/

Summary and Conclusions

What can one conclude from the information presented in this article?

1. We can conclude from the rifle tests that, on the average, experts cannot do what Oswald allegedly did.
2. We can conclude from the stair race that if Oswald was the assassin he may well have arrived on the second floor after Officer Baker.
3. We can conclude from the work of Robert Cutler that the single bullet theory is mathematically improbable to say the least.

Footnotes

- /1/ Warren, Earl et al, Hearings Before the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964, Volume V, p. 160
- /2/ Warren, Earl et al, Report of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964, p. 105
- /3/ Epstein, Edward J., Inquest, Viking Press, 1966, p. 142
- /4/ Epstein, Ibid, p. 143
- /5/ Ibid, p. 143
- /6/ White, Stephen, Should We Now Believe the Warren Report?, MacMillan Company, 1968, p. 225
- /7/ Thompson, Josiah, Six Seconds in Dallas, Bernard Geis Associates, 1967, p. 294
- /8/ Roffman, Howard, Presumed Guilty, Associated University Press, 1975, p. 63-4
- /9/ Cutler, Robert, The Umbrella Man, Betts and Mirror Press, Danvers Ma, 1975, p. 45, 98
- /10/ Warren Report, p. 182
- /11/ Welsh, David, and David Lifton, "The Case for Three Assassins," Ramparts, January 1967, p. 78
- /12/ "A Matter of Reasonable Doubt," Life, November 25, 1966
- /13/ Model, F. Peter, and Robert J. Groden, JFK: The Case for Conspiracy, Manor Books, Inc. 1976, p. 147
- /14/ Warren Report, Hearings, Volume IV, p. 128
- /15/ Thompson, op. cit., p. 71
- /16/ Ibid, p. 210
- /17/ Cutler, op. cit., p. 37-44

ligence Agency; the letter said that a search of the Agency's records had failed to locate any document called "Click Beetle."

5. From: Richard E. Sprague, October 31, 1976
Hartsdale, NY 10530

I saw the book by Hugh McDonald, "a pointment in Dallas," before it was printed in 1975. He brought it to the office of the Committee to Investigate Assassinations in Washington about 1973, seeking help to get it published. There were several copies of the manuscript there for several months. A number of the researchers examined it, including Bud Fensterwald, Bob Smith, Paris Flammonde, Fletcher Prouty, myself, and others.

In the original book McDonald said Saul fired from the second floor of the County Records Building in Dealey Plaza. The trees, walls, etc., in Dealey Plaza make that impossible. In the final book he does not mention the floor of the County Records Building from which Saul is supposed to have fired. In the original book, he says he met Saul in Spain. In the final book he says he met Saul in London. In the original book, he said he made Saul confess by holding a pistol to his head. In the final book there is nothing like that. In the original book he says he tracked down Saul by the use of photographs, and there is no mention of the CIA agent Kimsey. In the book as published, the tracking down by photographs is not mentioned and Kimsey plays a leading role.

These changes (and probably others) cast considerable doubt for me on Hugh McDonald's reporting. □

CIA assassination plots. The story of AM/Lash — the agent who, according to the new and more sophisticated "Castro did it" scenario, betrayed a plot in late 1963 to Castro and supposedly triggered Castro's act of retaliation against JFK — was taken straight from the 1967 Inspector General's Report.

The "Castro Did It" Theory is False

The "Castro did it" story is false. It ignores the evidence about the relationship between Kennedy and Castro in 1963. Kennedy was cracking down on CIA-Cuban exile raids, Kennedy was at the same time actively negotiating a reconciliation with Castro. It ignores the distribution by Lee Harvey Oswald of the "Fair Play for Cuba" leaflets in New Orleans. And more besides.

And so, the "Castro did it" theory is not only false, but also represents a new official cover-up story, a successor to the "lone-assassin" cover-up. In 1976, as in 1967, it is a diversion, designed to derail the real investigation.

References

The Final Report of the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, U.S. Senate; Vol. V, "The Investigation of the Assassination of President John Kennedy: Performance of the Intelligence Agencies."

"Washington Post," March 7, 1976.

"Washington Post," August 22, 1976.

"New York Times," August 9, 10, 14, 1974.

"Detroit News," June 27, 1976.

"Las Vegas Sun," March 1, 1976. □